



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/621,322	07/20/2000	Assaf Govari	BIO-103	3443

7590 11/22/2002

Philip S Johnson
Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

MANTIS MERCADER, ELENI M

[REDACTED]
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3737

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/621,322

Applicant(s)

GOVARI, ASSAF

Examiner

Eleni Mantis Mercader

Art Unit

3737

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 and 4. 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than 150 words and legal phraseology such as "comprises" should be avoided. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2-9 and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2 and 12 are vague and indefinite in that the step of "concluding" the calibration method is conclusory and does not set forth the step or steps to accomplish that task rendering the scope of the claims unascertainable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker'032.

Acker'032 teaches all the features of the instant invention including the use of a medical probe being introduced within a magnetic field, aligning the sensor incorporated in the probe within the mapping volume and performing a calibration method correcting for any errors on the basis of a calibration procedure, wherein the calibration is repeated though-out the mapping volume (see Figure 1 and Figure 4; also see col. 5, lines 56-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; referring to a sensor 30 included in a medical probe which detects magnetic fields and col. 10, lines 7-67 and col. 11, lines 1-19; describing the calibration procedure within the magnetic field).

Acker'032 does not specifically teach the mathematical formula for calibration as claimed in the instant invention. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have used a functional equivalent of such a calibration as used in Acker'032 which would determine the calibration on the basis of the difference between the expected and actual measurement and make a determination as to an acceptable error limit, as these constitute calibration procedures well within the knowledge of skilled artisans. In comparing Figures 1 and 4 of Acker'032 with Figures 1 and 2 of the instant invention, it is evident that the dimensions of the mapping areas are comparable.

7. Claims 8-9 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker'032 as applied to claims 7 and 19 above, and further in view of Glassman et al.'401.

Acker'032 does not teach the use of the robot for manipulating the calibration of the procedure by moving the medical probe incorporating the sensor.

In the same field of endeavor, Glassman et al.'401 teaches the use of a robot to manipulate the medical probe of interest in order to automate medical procedures (see col. 2, lines 18-46).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to have modified Acker'032 and incorporated the teaching of Glassman et al.'401 to carry out the calibration procedure of the medical probe of interest as that would automate the calibration procedure.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni Mantis Mercader whose telephone number is 703 308-0899. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri., 8:00 a.m.-6:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marvin Lateef can be reached on 703 308-3256. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3590 for regular communications and 703 308-0758 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0858.



Eleni Mantis Mercader
Examiner
Art Unit 3737

EMM
November 14, 2002